

comparing signal characteristics of said silence sample with signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample; and,

attributing said isolated noise sample to said isolated computer component when said signal characteristics of said silence sample differ by a preset threshold from said signal characteristics of said isolated noise sample.

2. (Amended) A method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps of:  
logging said signal characteristics of said silence sample and said isolated noise sample;  
reporting excess noise identified in said attributing step; and,  
suggesting a remedy for said identified excess noise.

REMARKS:

These remarks are set forth in response to the Office Action mailed May 8, 2002. As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1-12 are pending in the application. In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting. Notwithstanding, the Examiner has indicated that a properly executed and filed terminal disclaimer will overcome such rejection. In consequence, the Applicants enclose herewith a properly executed terminal disclaimer.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 2, 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 1 in an effort to provide antecedent basis for the recited element, "second recording" of claims 5 and 6. Also, the Applicants have amended claim 2, changing "identifying step" to "attributing step" to further provide antecedent basis for recited claim elements in claim 2. Support for these amendments